SURVEY OF

Alberta Chief Municipal Administrators and Municipal Development Officers

LOCAL GOVERNMENT STUDIES

Alberta

SURVEY OF ALBERTA CHIEF MUNICIPAL ADMINISTRATORS AND MUNICIPAL DEVELOPMENT OFFICERS

A Study Prepared for the Inter-Agency Planning Branch, Alberta Municipal Affairs, and Local Government Studies, Faculty of Extension, University of Alberta

E. F. Einsiedel, Ph.D.
Consultant

Edmonton, Alberta
September, 1983

PROJECT STAFF

E.F. Einsiedel, Project Director

James Goodwin, Research Associate

Anthony Mak, Research Associate

FOREWORD

In these times of fiscal restraint and slow economic growth, municipalities are finding it increasingly difficult to make ends meet. Reduced tax revenues make it inevitable that municipal services will be cut and initiatives for new programs foregone. The area of land use planning frequently comes under scrutiny in such times, as a labour intensive activity, dealing with future concerns rather than present-day realities.

As this report and its companion volume --- Survey of Planning Needs and Training Preferences of Alberta Elected Officials --- illustrate, municipal administrators and elected officials view land use planning as an important part of their duties. While its future aspects are not dismissed, planning is seen largely as the pragmatic, daily activity of ensuring that land is subdivided in a legally proper manner; developments occur in a way which ensures harmony of uses; and the most cost-effective choices are made for services and facilities.

Not surprisingly, perhaps, municipal leaders spend a great deal of their time dealing with planning matters. More now than previously, in some cases, because the funds to hire planning consultants are no longer available. Clearly, additional pressures will fall on existing administrators and elected officials to make their own planning decisions.

This report and its companion volume present the results of a study commissioned to determine the extent to which municipal elected officials and administrators felt that they needed training assistance to strengthen their abilities in making planning decisions. The study was commissioned jointly by the Local Government Studies program at the University of Alberta, and Inter-Agency Planning Branch, Alberta Municipal Affairs. Both of these agencies have an interest in assisting municipal governments to continue to maintain their high quality of decision-making in responding to the needs of their residents.

The sponsors of this study hope that it will stimulate interest and discussion among those involved in the important job of local government. They welcome any comments or suggestions readers might like to pass along.

A. A. (Bert) Einsiedel
Local Government Studies
University of Alberta
Ring House #2
Edmonton, Alberta T6G 2E2

432-5048

Graham Murchie
Inter-Agency Planning Branch
Alberta Municipal Affairs
9925 - 107 Street
Edmonton, Alberta T5K 2H9

427-2106

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

I. Introduction 1

II. Methodology 2

A. Sample 2

B. Survey Instrument 3

C. Procedure 4

D. Statistical Note 5

III. Results 5

A. Response Rate 5

B. Respondent Profile 6

C. General Training Preferences 7

1. Professional Development Background 7

2. Training Preferences 7

3. Barriers to Professional Development Activities 9

4. Motivations for Further Training 11

5. Summary 12

D. Planning: Functions and Training Needs 13

1. Quality of Performance 13

2. Respondent Differences 15

3. Preferred Training Method 17

4. Time Spent on Planning Functions 17

5 Assistance from Regional Planning Commission 17

6. Summary 18

E. The Municipal Administrator and His Job 19

1. Problems 20

2. Job Satisfaction 21

LIST OF TABLES

Number		Page
1	Respondent Demographics	23
2	Characteristics of Respondents' Municipalities	24
3	Continuing Education Activities of Respondents	25
4	Number of Professional Development Workshops, By Administrative Unit	26
5	General Training Format Preferences	27
6	General Training Schedule Preferences	28
7	Postsecondary Institution to Most Likely Attend	29
8	Distance from Postsecondary Centre and Willingness to Travel	30
9	Barriers to Further Training	31
10	Most Often Cited Barriers, By Respondent Differences	32
11	Reasons for Taking Courses, Seminars in Local Government	33
12	Planning: Need Areas and Training Preferences	34
13	Need Areas in Planning for Administrators and Development Officers	37
14	Need Areas in Planning for Administrative Staff	39
15	Planning Functions, By Title, Population, Urbanization	41
16	Research Functions, By Title, Population, Urbanization	42
17	Development Operations, By Title, Population, and Urbanization	43
18	Amount, Quality of Assistance from RPC	44
19	Amount of Assistance from RPC, By Administrative Unit	45
20	Amount of Assistance from RPC for Rural and Urban Municipalities	46

21	Amount of Assistance from RPC, By Job Title	47
22	Most Important Problems in Jobs	48
23	Sources and Amount of Pressure	49

INTRODUCTION

This study was conducted under the joint sponsorship of Local Government Studies, Faculty of Extension, University of Alberta, and the Inter-Agency Planning Branch, Alberta Municipal Affairs.

The Local Government Studies Program has been involved in providing continuing education for local government officials in the province of Alberta. The Inter-Agency Planning Branch has also maintained a similar involvement, particularly in the area of planning, and this study is a product of this mutual interest in the professional development of the same target population: local government officials, both elected and appointed.

This study was designed with the following objectives:

1. To identify general training preferences of Chief Municipal Administrators and Municipal Development Officers.
2. To identify both incentives and barriers -- both personal and organizational -- to further professional development.
3. To determine the skills and functions performed by Administrators and Development Officers in the planning area and to identify the "need" areas for further training for more effective municipal planning.
4. To provide a research data base on Administrators and Development Officers to support future studies that will contribute to our understanding of local government in Alberta.

This study was conceived in conjunction with a concurrent one conducted on elected officials (particularly mayors, reeves, and councillors on the Regional Planning Commissions) for similar objectives.[1]

METHODOLOGY

The Sample

A proportionate stratified sample of 179 municipalities was drawn randomly from the population of Alberta municipalities with the sample broken down into the following categories:

Cities	5
Towns	54
Villages	63
Summer Villages	17
Municipal Districts	9
Counties	15
Improvement Districts	9
Special Areas	4
Total	176

There were 169 Chief Municipal Administrators for the 176 municipalities, with a few administrators supervising more than one municipality (this was true especially for some summer villages).

---

[1]See E.F. Einsiedel, "Survey of Planning Needs and Training Preferences of Alberta Elected Offices", Edmonton, Alberta, 1983.

Fifty-eight of these municipalities had separate Municipal Development Officers, making for a total of 227 Chief Municipal Administrators and Municipal Develpoment Officers constituting the sample.

The Survey Instrument

There were four major sections developed for the survey instrument, keeping in mind the objectives of the study as outlined earlier. These sections included: (a) a profile of the municipality, looking at such characteristics as type of administrative unit, size of the council, the size of permanent staff and population of the municipality; (b) general training preferences of the respondents; (c) planning functions, need areas and training preferences; and (d) a detailed profile of the respondents. The section on planning functions in particular was drawn up with the assistance of the following sources:

1. A list of skills and functions of Municipal Development Officers, developed by the Inter-Agency Planning Branch.
2. Twelve councillors, mayors, Chief Municipal Administrators and Municipal Development Officers (three for each position), none of whom were in the sample, were interviewed about their tasks and the skills they thought were necessary to carry out their planning functions.
3. A previous study of the Inter-Agency Planning Branch[1] which identified "need areas" for further training based on a mail survey to government and private sector planners in Alberta.

---

[1]Inter-Agency Planning Branch, "Training Needs of Planners: Skills for More Effective Planning", Alberta Municipal Affairs, Edmonton, Alberta, April, 1982.

Procedure

Following the development of the questionnaire, the survey instrument was pretested on four respondents, none of whom were in the sample. As the questionnaire was being finalized, letters were sent out to the appropriate Chief Administrative Officer and Municipal Development Officer informing them of their inclusion in the sample, the forthcoming questionnaire, and explaining the objectives of the study (Appendix A).

Given the naturally low response rate for mailed questionnaires and the length of this particular questionnaire, four procedures were employed to increase participation: the preliminary letter described earlier was sent out, strongly urging the members of the sample to participate and emphasizing the importance of the study to professional development; second, an addressed, stamped envelope was enclosed with the questionnaire for ease of return; and third (and most important), an incentive was utilized.

The incentive consisted of a personal portable computer (Commodore Vic 20) which respondents were told they would be eligible for if they returned their completed questionnaires by a certain date. Small promotional brochures of this computer were enclosed along with the questionnaires and accompanying cover letter (Appendix B). The identification numbers of eligible questionnaires were later included in a drawing and the respondent with the winning number notified of his selection and the details about claiming his prize.

A fourth procedure was also employed wherein one of the project staff members attended the Annual Refresher Course in Municipal

Administration held in Banff and sponsored by Local Government Studies. Our staff member personally distributed (and later collected) questionnaires to respondents who were at the conference.

After the drawing, the questionnaires were coded, a code book was set up, and the data key-punched. Data were analyzed using the standard SPSS program (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences) on the University of Alberta's computer system.

Statistical Note. In cases where cross-tabulations were run, the Chi Square test of significance was used to determine statistical significance using the 95% confidence level. This means that if the probability value of a relationship being tested between two variables (say, sex and completion of the Local Government Certificate Program) is found to be .05 or less using the Chi Square test of significance, this says there is only one chance in 20 (or five times out of a hundred) that the relationship being tested is due to chance. In this case, the relationship between sex and completion of program is a true relationship; that is, male administrators are significantly more likely/less likely than female administrators to have completed/not completed the certificate program. Where appropriate, significance test results are presented with tables.

RESULTS

Response Rate

Completed questionnaires were received from 153 respondents, 33 of whom were Municipal Development Officers, making for a response rate

of 67%, an excellent response rate given the length of the questionnaire and average response rates for mailed questionnaires.

Profile of Respondents

The typical respondent was male, between 36 to 45 years old (mean age: 41 years), had some college education or a technical diploma, was making between $25,000 to $34,000 annually in his job as Administrator or Development Officer, and had lived in the municipality for more than 10 years. He also tended to be active in the community as well as his profession, being a member of one or two social or religious organizations and also tended to be a member of one or two professional organizations (Table 1).

Table 2 summarizes characteristics of respondents' municipalities. The majority come from urban areas (71%), have municipal councils with between seven to nine members, and are from small communities with populations of 1,000 or less. Most respondents also have very small or very large permanent full-time staff sizes (between zero and three or 31 or more). It should be noted that the distributions are not to be taken as characteristic of municipalities in the sample but as characteristic of the respondents' municipalities. Some categories are inflated (or under-represented) because of the inclusion of Municipal Development Officers in the study, over-representing the type of municipality these officials are from as these would also have the Chief Municipal Administrator.

General Training Preferences

Professional Development Background. Most respondents appear to have actively engaged in some continuing education activity. As Table 3 shows, about 44% were either currently taking or had completed the Local Government Certificate Program with the Faculty of Extension's Local Government Studies Program. Another 10% said they planned to enroll in the program and close to one-fifth said they "wanted to know more."

Over two thirds had also attended or were registered in one to four workshops or courses in the past year.

Are respondents from rural districts more or less likely to engage in these professional development activities compared to those from urban areas? Table 4 shows that the type of administrative unit indeed makes a difference. Looking at the extreme categories for urban and rural respondents, three times as many respondents from the latter type of administrative unit did not take any courses or workshops in the previous year as those from urban units; three times as many respondents from urban units, on the other hand, took at least five or more courses or workshops in the preceding year.

Training Preferences. Respondents were provided a list of ways in which courses or workshops in any area of local government could be offered and were asked to indicate which format they would prefer, were they to update or broaden their skills. Table 5 shows the majority (79%) had a preference for the short course of one to three days; next

choices were a midweek seminar or workshop (56%) and a correspondence course (55%). These choices obviously indicate a preference for continuing education via short-term programs or accomplished at the respondent's own pace and schedule, as the choice of the correspondence course format suggests.

There was also a preference for taking courses or seminars in the fall and winter and during the middle of the week (Wednesday and Thursday). There was no marked preference for a particular time of day as roughly three-quarters were as likely to take a course in the morning as in the afternoon or evening (Table 6).

Table 7 summarizes the post-secondary institution preferences of respondents, were they to take local government courses. The University of Alberta, Lakeland College, University of Lethbridge, Red Deer College and University of Calgary were mentioned most frequently, in decreasing order of mentions.

Respondents' access to a post-secondary education centre was also evaluated. Generally, most respondents did not live in a city or town that had a post-secondary education centre although close to half lived within 40 miles of one. However, only a little over one-quarter were willing to travel between 30 to 50 miles to take a course on a regular basis while half were willing to travel up to 30 miles (Table 8).

Cost may not be too much of a factor for most respondents as about four-fifths (79%) said their employer would pay for professional development courses. However, as many as half of the respondents also indicated they themselves would pay. Since the question asked

respondents to check "yes" or "no" for each financial source, there are obviously some respondents who rely on both their employer and their personal funds to support professional development courses. Only 7% said they would be supported by scholarships or bursaries and 5% mentioned Alberta Municipal Affairs, while 3% mentioned other sources.

Barriers to Professional Development Activities. If cost was not too important a factor, what other barriers might have existed or still exist to hinder these administrative officials from taking courses in the past or in the future? Respondents were asked which of a list of reasons had made it difficult for them to take courses in the past or might prevent them from taking courses in the future. Interestingly enough, the two factors most often cited were logistic rather than motivational or course-related (Table 9). Almost two thirds mentioned scheduling and timing of training (65%) and about the same number (64%) complained of courses not being offered in the right location. Other problems commonly mentioned were "not enough time" (58%), "home responsibilities" (44%), and "lack of replacement or back-up personnel" (45%). A little over one-third said courses were not relevant to their needs (35%).

Respondents were also asked to list the two most important barriers from the ones provided. If the number of mentions were added up regardless of whether they were mentioned first or second, the reason "not enough time" was mentioned most often.

Were different factors likely to be cited by different types of respondents? This appears to be the case when the most commonly cited factors were cross-tabulated by demographic and municipality characteristics (Table 10). For instance:

- Older respondents were more likely than younger ones to say courses were not relevant to their needs.
- Respondents from smaller communities, those with smaller staff sizes, and those who were younger tended to cite home responsibilities significantly more often than their counterparts.
- Those who mentioned lack of back-up personnel were more likely to be younger and to come from the smallest as well as the largest municipalities.

These differences are not too surprising, given the fact that older respondents tend to be more experienced and would therefore feel they have less need for continuing education. Younger respondents on the other hand are more likely to have less experience and will probably be found in smaller municipalities. They are also likely to have young children at home, making home responsibilities rank high for them. These are also the same respondents who may not have back-up personnel to allow them to pursue further professional development activities. Those from the largest municipalities might also tend to have a larger range of functions but also a more specialized set of functions and might thus consider themselves difficult to replace.

Given the right circumstances and if courses of interest were offered, respondents were asked to indicate which type of program they

would commit themselves to: courses or workshops which did not lead to a certificate; a program which did; one which led to a college diploma, or one which resulted in a university degree. Over four-fifths (88%) favored a program of courses leading to a certificate while the same percentage (65%) mentioned workshops or courses which did not lead to a certificate as those who selected a program of courses leading to a college diploma. Three in five said they could commit themselves to a program leading to a university degree.

Motivations. Engaging in professional development activities is motivated by a number of reasons. These could be internal (e.g., "satisfy a personal need"), external ("required by municipality"), or the existence of direct job incentives such as pay increases or career advancement. For most people, it is more likely a combination of motivations that encourage efforts toward career development, although the importance of these motives may vary. As Table 11 shows, the improvement in job effectiveness was ranked as highly important by over nine in ten respondents. Other reasons ranked high in importance included satisfying a personal need (ranked by 63% either 4 or 5 on a five-point scale) as well as career advancement (66%). The slight differences in rank order between the percentage figures and the mean ratings are simply due to the fact that the means result from the use of the entire scale (1 to 5 where 1 was not important, 5 was very important) while the percentages were calculated from the sum of those rating each item either "4" or "5" (where 5 was "very important").

Satisfaction of a personal need and the increase of job effectiveness were likely to be mentioned by respondents regardless of demographic or municipality differences. However, those more likely to be motivated by career advancement reasons tended to come from larger municipalities, to have or belong to larger staffs, and to be younger. Older respondents and those who come from smaller municipalities were more likely to suggest "improved status in the community" as a reason for more professional development.

Summary: General Training Preferences

- Respondents appeared to be actively pursuing professional development activites. Over two-thirds had participated in one to four workshops or courses in the preceding year and 44% were either enrolled in or had completed the Local Government Certificate Program.
- About eight in ten respondents preferred taking short courses or workshops lasting from one to three days.
- Respondents preferred taking these courses in the fall or winter and ideally, during the middle of the week (Wednesday or Thursday). No marked preference was expressed for a specific time of day.
- Most respondents did not live in a town or city that had a post-secondary education centre although close to half lived within 40 miles of one. However, most were unwilling to travel this distance to take a course on a regular basis. Half of the respondents were willing to travel up to 30 miles.

- o Cost is not a factor in further training as most municipalities appear to be paying for professional development courses.
- o The major barriers to further training appear to be lack of time, poor scheduling and location of courses, home responsibilities, and lack of replacement or back-up personnel.
- o Close to nine out of ten respondents preferred a program of courses leading to a certificate.
- o The major motivation for further training was to increase job effectiveness. Also important was satisfying a personal need.

Planning: Functions and Training Needs

Quality of Performance. Respondents were provided a detailed list of planning functions and functional areas and asked (a) to indicate whether they delegated the function; (b) to rate their own performance if they performed the function primarily by themselves; (c) to rate their staff's performance if their staff performed the function primarily; and (d) to indicate whether they preferred training for that particular function in the form of structured courses, short-term workshops or seminars, or individual-study kits or manuals.

Unfortunately, because of the length of the list of items, many respondents confused delegation with performance. For instance, halfway through the list a number of respondents would respond to the first section (on whether they delegated the function) using performance rather than delegation as the criterion. Because of the unreliability of this section, the data were not utilized and analysis was limited instead to the evaluations of the respondent's own and staff

performance and the section on preferred training format. These results are shown in Table 12.

To simplify the results of this table, a shorter summary of the results was compiled based on items that were rated by at least 75 respondents and which received a "poor" to "fair" rating from at least 45%. As Table 13 shows, Chief Municipal Administrators and Development Officers saw weaknesses in their performance in the areas of public communications, research, planning (including dealing with development operations in particular), and also in the area of management skills.

In the area of public communications, one out of every two respondents rated themselves poor or fair in holding public meetings and making presentations before council or municipal planning committees; at least three in five gave themselves poor to fair marks for preparing public information materials and making presentations before the Alberta Planning Board.

In the area of research, performance appraisal was even much lower. About three-quarters rated themselves poor or fair for conducting research, evaluating consultants' proposals, understanding and evaluating research data and preparing the general municipal plan. About two-thirds gave themselves a similar rating in their preparation of the municipal position on appeals.

In overseeing development operations in their communities, three in five gave themselves low marks for evaluating subdivision proposals and enforcing development agreements. Slightly over two-thirds indicated poor or fair performance in drafting or negotiating

development agreements, supervising developer operations as well as assessing development levies.

At least three-fifths rated themselves as poor or fair in such specific planning functions as knowing the government agencies involved in planning and interacting with these agencies, drafting, amending, and enforcing land-use bylaws, and understanding and interpreting the provincial Planning Act.

Such management skills as conducting staff meetings, hiring and supervising support staff, and maintaining records, were evaluated as poor or fair by at least 45%.

Respondent Differences and Planning. Based on the planning functions and skills in the previous summary tables corresponding with the highest need areas, it is not unreasonable to expect differences in performance evaluations according to respondent or municipality characteristics. Three variables that would most likely introduce variations in these evaluations could be the respondent's job title (whether he or she was the Chief Municipal Administrator or Municipal Development Officer), whether the municipality was rural or urban, and the municipality's population size. Analysis was conducted only on respondents' own performance ratings.

This general expectation, that population size, job title, and urbanization would significantly explain variations in performance evaluations, was supported but in an interesting manner. Differences cropped up in the functional areas of planning (Table 15), research (Table 16), and development operations (Table 17). Evaluations in the

more general areas of public communications and management skills did not differ significantly between Chief Administrators and Development Officers, between rural and urban, and between municipalities of different sizes.

Not surprisingly, more Chief Administrators gave themselves poor to fair ratings than Development Officers in specific planning areas, from knowing and interacting with government agencies to drafting and enforcing land-use bylaws (Table 15). Also, smaller municipalities in general tended to be weaker in these areas than larger ones. Urbanization did not make a difference except in "knowing government agencies involved in planning", with more urban respondents evaluating themselves poorly than rural respondents. Not surprisingly, population size appears to explain differences better than urbanization as urban municipalities in Alberta do vary greatly in population size.

In the area of research skills (Table 16), Municipal Development Officers were more likely than Chief Administrators to rate themseives poorly. This was especially true for evaluating and conducting research. Chief Administrators rated themselves more poorly in the preparation of the municipality's position on appeals. Again, respondents from smaller municipalities were more likely to rate themselves poorly on conducting research than those from larger ones.

Finally, in the area of development operations, Chief Administrators again rated themselves worse than Development Officers (Table 17). This is not surprising, given that the latter presumably treat general planning as their primary function. It highlights the greater

training need for Chief Administrators, however, given that they must perform these planning functions as part of their responsibilities when there is no Development Officer.

Again, not surprisingly, significant differences were found according to size of the municipality, with smaller ones showing poorer performance appraisals than larger municipalities.

Preferred Training Method. Across the board, respondents had a distinct preference for short-term workshops or seminars. As Table 12 shows, this format was selected by at least half of the respondents for almost all the items. Structured courses and individual study were each chosen by less than 10% for almost all the functions or skills listed. There were only two items where at least one-fifth of the respondents chose a format other than short-term workshops. These items were "Prepare Development Permits" and "Know Government Agencies Involved in the Planning Process." For both these items, the preferred format was individual study through kits or manuals.

Time Spent on Planning. Respondents were asked how much of their time was devoted to the planning functions they had just evaluated. About one-third said less than a quarter of their time was spent on these functions; two in five said 25% of their time was spent on planning and about 27% said they spent half their time on planning areas.

Amount and Quality of Assistance from RPC. There were more respondents who gave higher ratings to the quality of assistance than

the amount of assistance they received from their Regional Planning Commission (Table 18). About 42% said they got a little assistance (ratings of 1 to 3 on a 5-point scale where 1 was "hardly any") compared to one-third who said this assistance was poor to fair (again, 1 to 3 on a 5-point scale where 1 was "poor"). Thus two-thirds rated the quality of assistance highly compared to less than three-fifths rating the amount of assistance highly.

While quality of assistance did not appear to vary across municipal and respondent characteristics, there was a difference in perceived amount of assistance received according to administrative unit (Table 19). These results become clearer when administrative units are more broadly categorized according to whether they are rural or urban (Table 20). There were twice as many rural respondents who said they got hardly any assistance. On the other hand, almost two-thirds of the respondents from urban municipalities said they got a lot of assistance compared to less than half (42%) of those from rural municipalities.

Finally, Municipal Development Officers were more likely to say they got little assistance from their planning commissions than Chief Administrators (Table 21).

Summary: Planning Functions and Training Needs

This section summarizes the major findings on Planning Functions and Skills and Potential Areas for Further Training:

- Potential areas for further training included skills in public communications, management, research, development operations, and planning functions.

- o Need areas did not vary by population size, job title of respondent or whether the municipality was rural or urban for public communications and management.
- o Planning areas requiring higher levels of technical expertise or more specialized information such as research, development operations, and planning functions varied by population size and job title. Respondents from smaller municipalities were more likely than those from larger ones to rate their performance in these areas as being poor or fair. Chief Municipal Administrators were more likely to give themselves lower ratings than Municipal Development Officers.
- o The most commonly preferred training method across practically all planning skills was the short-term seminar or workshop.
- o Two in five respondents spent at least one-quarter of their time on planning functions.
- o Respondents were generally satisfied with the assistance they received from their Regional Planning Commissions, with more respondents satisfied with the quality rather than amount of assistance. Respondents from rural municipalities were more likely to say they got little assistance than those from urban municipalities.

The Municipal Administrator and His Job

The job of a municipal administrator is obviously not an easy one. Many of these local government officials face tasks and demands that would daunt any manager. They are expected to deal with a

wide range of problems, from something as mundane as weed control to something as complex as applying the provincial Planning Act. Their jobs require skills in everything from accounting to law. How do these administrators perceive their jobs, what kinds of problems do they encounter and how much influence do they wield? This section will briefly look at these municipal administrators and their jobs.

Most of the Chief Administrators and Development Officers were working full-time on their jobs. About 20% said they had other part-time jobs. That their jobs are indeed demanding is evidenced by the fact that close to half (47%) said they worked more than 40 hours a week. However, if length of time on the job is any indication of satisfaction, then most officials surveyed were probably reasonably satisfied. Over one-third (35%) had been on their jobs six years or more; another 37 % had been on their jobs three to five years. At least two-thirds of these officials had worked for their municipality for four years (36% had worked for their municipalities between four and eight years while 30% had worked with the same municipality nine years or more).

Problems on the Job. Respondents were asked what they thought was "the most important problem you have in your job with your municipality." As Table 22 shows, about one-third mentioned a public communications/public relations problem. Over one-fifth mentioned some management problem (e.g., labor-management problems, supervising staff, etc.) while less than one-fifth mentioned a problem in the planning

area (e.g., dealing with developers). About the same number mentioned the job itself as being too demanding, too complex or time-consuming.

Given the nature of the job, it is inevitable that these administrators are subject to pressure from various sources. Respondents were asked how much pressure they got from various groups such as the public, council, developers, and community business people. The public appears to be the greatest source of pressure for many of these officials, followed by the municipal council (43% and 39%, respectively, said there was "a lot" of pressure from these groups). Only 23% said developers put a lot of pressure on them while 15% said community business people pressured them "a lot" (Table 23).

Complaints about council in particular revolved around their ineffective decision-making (28%), their inexperience and inability to communicate effectively with the staff (20%), internal politics within council (9%), budget conflicts (8%), and their interference in administration (7%). Under one-fifth (18%) said they had no problems with council. These problems with council appear not to be too significant, however, as virtually all said they had a good to excellent relationship with council. In fact, hardly any said they had a poor or fair relationship with the council, the public, external authorities such as auditors or Alberta Municipal Affairs. Relative to these groups, these officials appear to have "worse" relations with the media, with about a quarter saying they had a poor or fair relationship with the media.

Job Satisfaction. There are a number of indicators one might use to evaluate how satisfied someone is with his or her job. Two measures that were used in this study were the clarity in job

responsibilities and the amount of influence on the job. Respondents were asked how clearly specified were their job responsibilities. Close to two-thirds (62%) said their responsibilities were clearly defined (4 or 5 on a 5-point scale where 5 was "very clear").

Asked how often their policy recommendations were adopted by council, four fifths said about 75% or almost all the time. There is some evidence here that at least in terms of lack of ambiguity and influence, these administrators can be considered highly satisfied with their jobs.

Table 1

RESPONDENT DEMOGRAPHICS

		Percent	Number
Age			
35 or less		32%	48
36 - 45		40	60
46 +		28	43
Education			
High School degree or less		40%	61
Some college, technical diploma		46	70
College degree or more		13	22
Income			
$14,999 or less		17%	26
15,000 to 24,999		20	30
25,000 to 34,000		35	53
35,000 to 44,999		16	24
45,000 +		12	17
Sex			
Male		65%	99
Female		35	53
Residency			
Not resident of municipality		21	32
Up to 2 years		14	21
3 - 5 years		21	32
6 - 10 years		19	29
More than 10 years		25	38
Membership in Organizations			
Social - Religious:	None	24	36
	1 - 2	67	100
	3 +	9	13
Civic:	None	52	78
	1 - 2	33	64
	3 +	5	7
Professional:	None	31	46
	1 - 2	63	94
	3 +	6	9

Table 2

CHARACTERISTICS OF RESPONDENTS' MUNICIPALITIES

	n	%
Administrative Unit		
County	22	14%
Municipal District	13	9
City	8	5
Town	56	37
Village	41	27
Summer Village	5	3
Improvement District	5	3
Special Area	3	2
Council Size		
Three or less	26	17%
4 - 6	28	18
7 - 9	92	61
10 +	6	4
Population Size		
1000 or less	57	38%
1001 to 4999	50	33
5000 +	46	29
Number of Full-Time Permanent Employees		
0 - 3	45	29%
4 - 10	31	20
11 - 30	30	20
31 +	47	31

Table 3

CONTINUING EDUCATION ACTIVITIES OF RESPONDENTS

	n	%
University of Alberta Certificate Program (Local Government)		
Completed Certificate	41	27%
Current Student	25	17
No, but plan to	15	10
No, and have no plans	42	28
Would like to know more	27	18
N =	150	100%
Number of Professional Development Courses, Workshops, Seminars Attended in Past Year		
None	28	19%
1 - 2	58	38
3 - 4	46	31
5 +	19	12
N =	151	100%

Table 4

NUMBER OF PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT WORKSHOPS, BY ADMINISTRATIVE UNIT

No. of Workshops	Administrative Unit							
	Cnty	M.D.	Sp. Ar.	I.D.	Cit	Town	Vill	S.V.
None	6	6	1	2	1	4	8	0
	27%	46%	33%	40%	12%	7%	19%	0%
1 - 2	9	5	2	1	2	21	17	1
	41	38	67	20	25	37	41	20
3 - 4	5	2	0	2	2	25	9	1
	23	15	0	40	25	45	22	20
5 +	2	0	0	0	3	6	7	3
	9	0	0	0	37	11	17	60

p = .01; N = 153

No. of Workshops	Rural		Urban	
	n	%	n	%
None	15	35%	13	12%
1 - 2	17	39	41	37
3 - 4	9	21	37	34
5 +	2	5	19	17

p = .05; N = 153

Table 5

GENERAL TRAINING FORMAT PREFERENCES

(Percent saying "Yes")

	n	%	Total N
Attend weekly classes in community centre	72	47	153
Attend week-end seminar or workshop	44	29	153
Attend midweek seminar or workshop	85	56	153
Attend short course of 1 - 3 days	119	79	153
Attend short course of 1 - 2 weeks	60	40	151
Take courses in college or university	52	34	152
Take correspondence course	83	55	151
Take course using TV while linked to instructor with telephone	51	34	150

Table 6

GENERAL TRAINING SCHEDULING PREFERENCES

	n	%	Total N
Season:			
Fall (Sept - Dec)	122	80	153
Winter (Jan - Apr)	120	78	153
Spring (May - June)	67	44	153
Summer (Jul - Aug)	26	17	153
Day of Week:			
Monday	76	51	149
Tuesday	81	54	149
Wednesday	100	67	150
Thursday	103	69	149
Friday	23	15	150
Saturday	16	11	150
Sunday	20	13	150
Time of Day:			
Morning	107	70	152
Afternoon	118	78	152
Evening	112	74	151

Table 7

POST-SECONDARY INSTITUTION TO MOST LIKELY ATTEND

	n	%
University of Alberta	27	25*
Lakeland College	20	13
University of Lethbridge	12	8
Red Deer College	11	7
University of Calgary	10	6
Adult Education Centre in Drumheller	8	5
Lethbridge Community College	7	5
Medicine Hat College	6	4
Athabasca University	5	3
Olds College	5	3
Grande Prairie Regional College	4	3
Fairview College	4	3
N.A.I.T.	4	3
S.A.I.T.	3	2
Adult Education Centre in Peace River	3	2
Keyano College	2	1
Grant MacEwan Comunity College	1	1
Mount Royal College	1	1
Adult Education Centre in Blairmore	1	1
Adult Education Centre in Hinton	1	1
Other Location	5	3

*Due to rounding off, some percentages may be the same for different size n's.

Table 8

DISTANCE FROM POST-SECONDARY EDUCATION CENTRE AND WILLINGNESS TO TRAVEL

	n	%
Distance of residence from nearest post-secondary education centre:		
Less than 20 miles	21	17%
20 - 39 miles	39	32
40 - 59 miles	25	20
60 - 79 miles	17	14
80 +	21	17
	123	100%
Distance each way respondent willing to travel to take a course:		
Unable to travel	3	2%
To 10 miles	10	7
To 20 miles	28	19
To 30 miles	37	25
To 50 miles	41	28
More than 50 miles	29	19
	148	100%

Table 9

BARRIERS TO FURTHER TRAINING

(Percent Saying "Yes")

	n	%	Total N
*Courses not relevant to my needs	54	35	152
*Courses not offered in right location (too far)	97	64	152
**Scheduling, timing of training	100	65	153
Strict attendance requirements	19	12	153
Don't meet requirements to begin program	11	7	152
**/*Not enough time	89	58	153
**Home responsibilities	67	44	153
**Lack of replacement, back-up personnel	69	45	153
Not enough energy, too tired	14	9	152
Cost (books, tuition, child care)	16	11	152
Time required to complete program	40	26	153
Transportation difficulties/ inconvenience	40	26	152
Lack of information on available training	37	25	150
Lack of personal interest	7	5	151
Courses won't lead to advancement, promotion	37	24	151
Employer or supervisor does not encourage me to take courses	30	20	153
Lack of council approval	30	20	152
Unwillingness to deal with university	9	6	151

Respondents were asked which two were most important barriers.
* represents items most often mentioned first, ** represents items most often mentioned second.

Table 10

MOST OFTEN CITED BARRIERS TO FURTHER TRAINING,

BY RESPONDENT DIFFERENCES

Barriers and Respondent Differences		n	Percent Saying "Yes"
1. Wrong Location (too far) *			
2. Poor Scheduling, Timing *			
3. Not Enough Time *			
4. Courses not relevant			
Age:	Under 35	12	24%
	36 - 45	27	46
	46 +	15	35
5. Home responsibilities			
Population:	1000 or less	33	60%
	1001 - 4999	20	39
	5000 +	14	30
No. employees:	0 - 5	33	55%
	6 - 30	21	44
	31 +	13	29
Age:	Under 35	35	62%
	36 - 45	25	42
	46 +	11	26
6. Lack Back-up Personnel			
Population:	1000 or less	33	60%
	1001 - 4999	17	33
	5000 +	19	41
Age:	Under 35	30	60%
	36 - 45	23	38
	46 +	16	37

*Respondents did not differ across various demographic or municipal categories. All other barriers show differences (at $p < .05$) at various levels of the given variables.

NOTE: Percentages should not add up to 100% as respondents evaluated each barrier separately by checking either "yes" or "no".

Table 11

REASONS FOR TAKING COURSES, SEMINARS IN LOCAL GOVERNMENT

	Percent Rating "4" or "5"	Total N	$\bar{X}$ Rating
Increase job effectiveness	93%	152	4.7
Lead to career advancement	66	152	3.7
Satisfy a personal need	63	152	3.8
Lead to certificate or diploma	61	151	3.7
Develop a better self image	50	151	3.5
Provide a pay increase	38	152	3.0
Lead to a university degree	38	150	3.0
Improve status in community	22	152	2.5
Required by municipality	21	151	2.4

Each item was presented with a 5-point scale where 1 was "Not Important" and 5 was "Very Important". Percentages represent those rating item 4 or 5 on the scale.

Table 12

PLANNING NEED AREAS AND TRAINING PREFERENCES

	Quality of your performance*			Quality of your staff's performance*			Most appropriate training method			
	Poor-Fair	Good	NA	Poor-Fair	Good	NA	SC	SW	IS	NR**
Functions										
Deal with public enquiries/ complaints	24	59	17	17	37	46	7	70	12	11
Hold public meetings/hearings	41	44	15	17	17	66	6	68	9	17
Prepare brochures, newspaper stories, or other public information materials	43	27	30	18	24	58	7	54	22	17
Prepare public/legal notices	33	46	21	17	23	60	6	56	24	14
Evaluate subdivision proposals	40	32	28	25	18	57	15	59	11	15
Draft and/or negotiate development agreements	51	24	25	21	14	65	16	55	14	15
Prepare development permits	26	39	35	18	35	47	4	55	22	19
Supervise developer operations	39	16	45	29	19	52	6	60	10	24
Enforce development agreements	38	23	39	27	13	60	8	54	11	27
Make presentations to council, municipal planning committees	37	41	22	19	18	63	7	58	12	23
Advise council on planning matters	44	31	25	20	18	62	11	54	11	24
Know government agencies involved in planning process	50	28	22	20	20	60	4	48	26	22
Interact with government agencies involved in planning	43	31	26	20	18	62	7	47	21	25
Understand and interpret Planning Act	58	22	20	22	16	62	12	53	15	20
Draft/amend land-use by-laws	42	28	30	19	15	66	10	49	14	27

Table 12 (continued)

PLANNING NEED AREAS AND TRAINING PREFERENCES

	Quality of your performance*			Quality of your staff's performance*			Most appropriate training method			
	Poor-Fair	Good	NA	Poor-Fair	Good	NA	SC	SW	IS	NR
Functions										
Understand, interpret building codes	37	11	52	29	20	51	11	48	12	29
Enforce Land-Use By-Laws	42	24	34	28	19	53	12	52	14	22
Assess development, off-site levies	45	17	38	25	15	60	7	48	17	28
Understand, evaluate research data	54	16	30	26	11	63	10	52	11	27
Conduct research (e.g. feasibility of annexation)	49	12	39	25	9	66	11	51	9	29
Evaluate consultants' proposals	50	18	32	20	12	68	6	52	10	32
Prepare/assist in preparation of general municipal plans	51	17	32	24	15	61	11	61	4	24
Conduct staff meetings	40	30	30	18	12	70	3	50	14	33
Hire or supervise support staff	34	37	29	17	16	67	7	48	12	33
Maintain records, conduct correspondence	30	37	33	22	28	50	7	54	15	24
Prepare municipal position on appeal	45	21	34	20	17	63	9	50	10	31
Present municipal position before APB	41	16	43	22	16	62	7	53	8	32
Prepare/assist in preparing utility and transportation documents	42	11	47	23	18	59	5	43	17	35
Areas:										
Transportation planning	26	10	64	25	21	54	7	41	12	40
Natural resources management	30	7	63	28	13	59	7	39	10	44
Recreation planning	27	9	64	30	23	47	10	46	9	35

Table 12 (continued)

PLANNING NEEED AREAS AND TRAINING PREFERENCES

	Quality of your performance*			Quality of your staff's performance*			Most appropriate training method			
	Poor-Fair	Good	NA	Poor-Fair	Good	NA	SC	SW	IS	NR
Areas										
Agricutural land use development	29	11	60	25	13	62	9	42	7	42
Residential land use development	36	23	41	22	19	59	11	50	7	32
Commercial land use development	42	17	41	26	15	59	10	51	7	32
Sanitation	27	17	56	26	20	54	10	46	9	35
Housing	35	14	51	27	16	57	7	44	12	37
Hazardous waste disposal	31	7	63	25	15	60	9	39	11	41

* Base: 153

**SC: Structured Courses; SW: Short Seminars or Workshops; IS: Individual Study Through Kits, Manuals; NR: No Response.

Table 13

NEED AREAS IN PLANNING FOR CHIEF MUNICIPAL ADMINISTRATORS AND MUNICIPAL DEVELOPMENT OFFICERS

	Poor-Fair	Good	Total N
Public Communications:			
Prepare brochures, newspaper stories, other public info. materials	61%	39%	130
Hold public meetings	49	51	130
Present municipal position before Alberta Planning Board	72	28	87
Make presentations to council, municipal planning committees	48	52	120
Research:			
Understand, evaluate research data	77	23	107
Conduct research	80	20	92
Evaluate consultants' proposals	74	26	104
Prepare/assist in preparing Gen. Municipal Plans	75	25	104
Prepare municipal position on appeals	68	32	101
Development Operations:			
Evaluate subdivision proposals	59	41	103
Draft/negotiate development agreements	68	32	114
Supervise developer operations	70	30	84
Enforce development agreements	62	38	93
Assess development, off-site levies	72	28	94

Table 13 (continued)

NEED AREAS IN PLANNING FOR CHIEF MUNICIPAL ADMINISTRATORS AND MUNICIPAL DEVELOPMENT OFFICERS

	Poor-Fair	Good	Total N
Planning:			
Advise council on planning matters	59	41	115
Know gov't agencies involved in planning	64	36	120
Interact w/ gov't agencies involved in planning	58	42	112
Understand, interpret Planning Act	72	28	123
Draft, amend land-use bylaws	60	40	107
Enforce land-use bylaws	64	36	100
Planning Areas:			
Residential land use development	61	39	90
Commercial land use development	71	29	90
Management/Clerical:			
Conduct staff meetings	57	43	107
Hire/supervise support staff	48	52	108
Maintain records, conduct correspondence	45	55	102
Prepare utility/transportation documents	79	21	81

Table 14

NEED AREAS IN PLANNING FOR ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF

	Poor-Fair	Good	Total N
Public Communications:			
Hold public meetings/hearings	50%	50%	52
Make presentations to council, munic. planning committees	52	48	56
Present municipal position before Alberta Planning Board	59	41	58
Research:			
Understand, evaluate research data	71	29	56
Conduct research	75	25	51
Prepare municipal position on appeals	54	46	56
Development Operations:			
Evaluate subdivision proposals	58	42	66
Draft/negotiate development agreements	61	39	54
Supervise developer operations	61	39	74
Enforce development agreements	67	33	61
Assess development, off-site levies	62	38	61
Planning:			
Advise council on planning matters	52	48	58
Know gov't agencies involved in planning	51	49	61
Interact w/ gov't agencies involved in planning	53	47	58
Understand, interpret Planning Act	58	42	59
Draft/amend land-use bylaws	56	44	52

Table 14 (continued)

NEED AREAS IN PLANNING FOR ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF

	Poor-Fair	Good	Total N
Planning:			
Understand, interpret building codes	59	41	75
Enforce land-use bylaws	60	40	72
Management/Clerical:			
Hire/supervise support staff	52	48	50
Prepare utility/transportation documents	57	43	62
Planning Areas:			
Transportation planning	54	46	70
Natural resources management	68	32	63
Recreation planning	56	44	80
Agricultural land use development	66	34	58
Residential land use development	54	46	63
Commercial land use development	63	37	62
Sanitation	56	44	70
Housing	63	34	65
Hazardous waste disposal	62	38	61

Table 15

PLANNING FUNCTIONS, BY TITLE, POPULATION, URBANIZATION

Functions and Characteristics		Rating Poor-Fair	Rating Good	Total N
1. Advise council planning matters				
Title:	CMA	62%	38%	
	MDO	48	52	(109)
Population:	1000 or less	71	29	
	1001 - 4999	57	43	
	5000 +	45	55	(115)
2. Know agencies involved in planning				
Title:	CMA	67%	33%	
	MDO	54	46	(115)
Urbanization:*	Rural	58	42	
	Urban	66	34	(120)
3. Interact w/ gov't. agencies				
Population:	1000 or less	77%	23%	
	1001 - 4999	43	57	
	5000 +	53	47	(111)
4. Draft land-use bylaws				
CAO:	CAO	63%	37%	
	MDO	42	58	(103)
Population:	1000 or less	74	26	
	1001 - 4999	58	42	
	5000 +	45	55	(107)
5. Enforce land-use bylaws				
Title:	CAO	70%	30%	
	MDO	30	70	(96)
Population:	1000 or less	76	24	
	1001 - 4999	52	48	
	5000 +	48	52	(99)
6. Assist in preparation of Gen. Municipal Plans				
Population:	1000 or less	82%	18%	
	1001 - 4999	72	28	
	5000 +	69	31	(104)

*Rural: includes counties, M.D.'s, Special Areas, and Improvement Districts.
Urban: includes Cities, Towns, Villages and Summer Villages.

All relationships $p < .05$.

Table 16

RESEARCH FUNCTIONS, BY TITLE, POPULATION, URBANIZATION

Functions and Characteristics		Rating Poor-Fair	Rating Good	Total N
1. Evaluate research				
Title:	CMA	74%	26%	
	MDO	87	13	(103)
2. Conduct Research				
Title:	CMA	77%	23%	
	MDO	89	11	(89)
Population:	1000 or less	88	12	
	1001 - 4999	79	21	
	5000 +	73	27	(92)
3. Prepare Municipal Position on Appeals				
Title:	CMA	74%	26%	
	MDO	54	46	(56)

All relationships significant at $p < .05$.

Table 17

DEVELOPMENT OPERATIONS, BY TITLE, POPULATION AND URBANIZATION

Functions and Characteristics		Rating Poor-Fair	Rating Good	Total N
1. Evaluate subdivision progress				
Title:	CMA	65%	35%	
	MDO	50	50	(100)
Population:	1000 or less	73%	27%	
	1001 - 4999	55	45	
	5000 +	44	56	(102)
2. Draft, negotiate development agreements				
Title:	CAO	72%	28%	
	MDO	64	36	(110)
Population:	1000 or less	79%	21%	
	1001 - 4999	62	38	
	5000 +	66	35	(113)
3. Prepare Development Permits				
Title:	CAO	47%	53%	
	MDO	26	74	(95)
4. Supervise Developer Operations				
Title:	CAO	78%	22%	
	MDO	59	41	(80)
Population:	1000 or less	81%	19%	
	1001 - 4999	70	30	
	5000 +	50	50	(84)
Urbanization:	Rural	50%	50%	
	Urban	80%	20%	(84)
5. Enforce development agreements				
Population:	1000 or less	79%	21%	
	1001 - 4999	56	44	
	5000 +	46	54	(92)

All relationships significant at $p < .05$.

Table 18

AMOUNT, QUALITY OF ASSISTANCE FROM RPC

		n	%
Amount:			
Hardly Any	1	19	13%
	2	17	12
	3	25	17
	4	29	20
A Lot	5	56	38
		146	100%
Quality:			
Poor	1	10	7%
	2	9	6
	3	29	20
	4	41	29
Excellent	5	55	38
		144	100%

Table 19

AMOUNT OF ASSISTANCE FROM RPC, BY ADMINISTRATIVE UNIT

	Administrative Unit							
Assistance	County	City	Mun. Dis.	Town	Vill.	Sum. Vill.	Sp. Area	Imp. Dis.
Hardly Any (1 - 2)	41%	67%	23%	15%	23%	20%	33%	20%
Some (3)	27	0	23	13	10	60	33	20
A Lot (4 - 5)	32	33	54	72	67	20	33	60
(n) =	(22)	(6)	(13)	(53)	(39)	(5)	(3)	(5)

p = .02 (Chi-Square)

Table 20

AMOUNT OF ASSISTANCE FROM RPC FOR RURAL AND URBAN MUNICIPALITIES

	Rural	Urban
Amount of Assistance:		
Hardly Any (1, 2)	14 (42%)	22 (21%)
Some (3)	11 (16%)	14 (14%)
A Lot (4, 5)	17 (42%)	67 (65%)
	n = 43	n = 103

p = .05

Table 21

AMOUNT OF ASSISTANCE FROM RPC, BY JOB TITLE

Assistance	Chief Municipal Administrator	Municipal Development Officer
Hardly Any (1, 2)	19%	45%
Some (3)	15	19
A Lot (4, 5)	67	36
(n)	(108)	(31)

p = .05

Table 22

MOST IMPORTANT PROBLEM IN JOB

	n	%
Public Relations, Communications	44	32%
Management Problems	30	32
Nature of Job	23	16
Planning	22	16
Other	8	6
No Problem	11	8

Table 23

SOURCES AND AMOUNT OF PRESSURE

(Percent Saying "A Lot")

	n	%
Sources:		
The public	66	43
Developers	35	23
Council	59	39
Community Business People	22	15

Scale was 1 to 5 where 1 was "Hardly Any" and 5 was "A Lot".
Percentages represent ratings of 4 and 5.

APPENDIX

A. Preliminary Letter

B. Cover Letter

C. Questionnaire

STUDIES IN LOCAL GOVERNMENT
UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA EXTENSION

May, 1983

Dear Chief Administrator/Municipal Development Officer:

The Studies in Local Government Program is implementing an expanded course development delivery program, the purpose of which is to increase our effectiveness in providing quality educational programming in municipal administration. Given a wider range of courses and easier access to educational resources, municipal administrators in our province could take better advantage of professional development opportunities that would enhance their individual careers and their professional effectiveness.

This summer we will be conducting a province-wide survey of municipalities to obtain current information that will help us design new courses, improve existing ones, as well as improve ways of administrators' access to the program's educational resources.

We are contacting you to alert you about the questionnaire you will be receiving in the mail within the next few weeks. We would like to stress the importance of your participation in this survey in order to ensure that the results we get are reliable and a valid representation of the views of municipal administrators and municipal development officers as a whole. Please be assured that you responses will be confidential.

The questionnaire will include questions in the following areas: the administrative and planning functions of municipal administrators and development officers, the in-career patterns and attitudes toward their job, and future training and professional development needs.

We hope we can count on your full participation in this project.

Sincerely,

Bert Einsiedel

A.A. Einsiedel, Jr., Ph.D.
Program Director

AAE/jp

FACULTY OF EXTENSION, THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA, RING HOUSE 2, EDMONTON, ALBERTA, T6G 2E2 · 432-5052

STUDIES IN LOCAL GOVERNMENT
UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA EXTENSION

June 20, 1983

Dear Chief Administrator/Municipal Development Officer:

Enclosed is the questionnaire we had informed you earlier was forthcoming. This is part of a large-scale study being conducted by the Studies in Local Government Program at The University of Alberta on the professional development needs of local government administrators and municipal development officers. The purpose of this study is to further refine and extend the program of professional development offerings through various academic and government agency institutions. It is also intended to contribute to a research base on local government administrators - who you are, what your job is like, and the problems you face.

We assure you that your responses are confidential. The numbers on the questionnaire are simply a means of record-keeping so we can follow up on non-respondents.

To help us express our appreciation for your cooperation in this study, we have decided to include the three-digit number on your questionnaire in a drawing. Questionnaires returned by July 20th will be eligible. The winning respondent will receive a Commodore Vic 20 home computer (worth approximately $400). This might be useful to you in your work or as entertainment for your family. In any case, we hope this is a helpful incentive for you, especially since your chances of winning this prize are rather high (only 250 questionnaires have been mailed out to randomly selected individuals such as yourself).

Both your professional associations - the Local Government Administrators Association and the Alberta Rural Municipal Administrators Association - are very supportive of this project. We are counting on your cooperation as well to insure that the results of this survey are reliable and representative of local government administrators and municipal development officers.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Albert A. Einsiedel
Program Director

AAE:g

Enclosure

Introduction

This questionnaire is for municipal administrators and municipal development officers in Alberta.

PLEASE MAIL COMPLETED QUESTIONNAIRE IN THE ENCLOSED POST-PAID ENVELOPE BY JULY 20, 1983.

CONTENTS

Section 1: Profile of Municipality

Section 2: Identification of General Training Preferences

Section 3: Planning: Functions, Problems, and Training Preferences

Section 4: Profile of Municipal Officer

Section 1: Profile of Municipality

1. What type of administrative unit do you work for:

   PLEASE CIRCLE APPROPRIATE NUMBER

   (1) county
   (2) city
   (3) municipal district
   (4) town
   (5) village
   (6) summer village
   (7) Special Area
   (8) Improvement District

2. What is the organizational structure of your municipality?

   PLEASE CIRCLE APPROPRIATE NUMBER

   (1) Council–committee (no Chief Administrative Officer)
   (2) Council–manager
   (3) Council–commission
   (4) Council–committee (C.A.O. or Commission–Board)
   (5) Council – Senior department head system
   (6) Council – department head system
   (7) Other: _____

3. What is the size of your council (including the reeve or mayor)? _____

4. What is the population of your municipality? _____

5. How many full–time permanent employees are there in your municipality? (Number of employees)_____

Section 2: General Training Preferences

6. From the following list of ways in which courses or workshops in any area of local government could be offered, which ones would you prefer should you desire to update or broaden your skills? PLEASE CIRCLE 1 OR 2 FOR EACH.

	Prefer	Not prefer
Attend weekly classes in a community centre	1	2
Attend a weekend seminar or workshop	1	2
Attend a midweek seminar or workshop	1	2
Attend a short course of 1 to 3 days	1	2
Attend a short course of a week to two weeks	1	2
Take courses in a college or university	1	2
Take a correspondence course	1	2
Take a course using television while linked to an instructor with a telephone	1	2
Other (Please specify)_____	1	2

7. Would you participate in courses or seminars in local government during the following seasons? CIRCLE 1 OR 2 FOR <u>EACH</u>.

a. Fall (September - December)	1. Yes	2. No
b. Winter (January - April)	1. Yes	2. No
c. Spring (May - June)	1. Yes	2. No
d. Summer (July - August)	1. Yes	2. No

8. Which <u>evenings</u> (if any) are most suited to your needs should you choose to take courses in local government? CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY.

Monday	1. Yes	2. No	Friday	1. Yes	2. No
Tuesday	1. Yes	2. No	Saturday	1. Yes	2. No
Wednesday	1. Yes	2. No	Sunday	1. Yes	2. No
Thursday	1. Yes	2. No			

9. Would you participate in local government courses or workshops during the following hours? CIRCLE 1 OR 2 FOR EACH

a. Morning	1. Yes	2. No
b. Afternoon	1. Yes	2. No
c. Evening	1. Yes	2. No

10. Do you live in a city or town that has a postsecondary education centre (adult education centre, college or university)?

1. Yes 2. No

11. If you do not live in a city or town that has a postsecondary education centre, what is the distance of your residence from the nearest one? (PLEASE CIRCLE ONE RESPONSE)

Less than 20 miles	1
20 - 39 miles	2
40 - 59 miles	3
60 - 79 miles	4
80 miles or more	5
Not applicable	9

12. If courses were offered on a regular basis, how far each way would you be prepared to travel to take a course? CIRCLE ONE ITEM ONLY.

Unable to travel	1
Up to 10 miles	2
Up to 20 miles	3
Up to 30 miles	4
Up to 50 miles	5
More than 50 miles	6

13. a. Which of the following reasons have made it difficult for you to take courses in the past or might prevent you from taking courses in the future? CIRCLE ALL THAT MAY APPLY.

	Yes	No
Courses are not relevant to my needs	1	2
Courses are not offered in the right location (too far)	1	2
Scheduling, timing of training	1	2
Strict attendance requirements	1	2
Don't meet requirements to begin program	1	2
Not enough time	1	2
Home responsibilities	1	2
Lack of replacement, back-up personnel	1	2
Not enough energy; too tired	1	2
Cost (books, tuition, child care)	1	2
Time required to complete program	1	2
Transportation difficulties and inconveniences	1	2
Lack of information on available training	1	2
Lack of personal interest	1	2
Courses won't lead to advancement, promotion	1	2
Employer or supervisor does not encourage me to take courses	1	2
Lack of council approval	1	2
Unwillingness to deal with university	1	2
Other barriers? _____	1	2

_____

b. Of all the above, which two are (were) the most important in hindering you from taking courses in local government?

1. _____

2. _____

14. Who pays (will pay) for courses you take for professional development? (CIRCLE 1 OR 2 FOR EACH).

	Yes	No
Employer	1	2
Myself	2	2
Scholarship or Bursary	3	2
Department of Municipal Affairs	4	2
Other (Please specify)_____	5	2

15. If the circumstances were right and courses of interest were offered, would you commit yourself to study in any of the following? CIRCLE 1 OR 2 FOR EACH.

	Yes	No
a. Courses or workshops which do not lead to a certificate	1	2
b. A program of courses leading to a certificate	1	2
c. A program of courses leading to a college diploma	1	2
d. A program of courses leading to a university degree	1	2

16. Listed below are a number of reasons for taking courses or seminars in local government. Please indicate how important each one is to you. Circle 1 if it's not important, 5 if it's very important, and 2, 3 or 4 if it's somewhere in between. Please circle only <u>one</u> number for each response.

	Not Important				Very Important
a. Satisfy a personal need	1	2	3	4	5
b. Develop a better self image	1	2	3	4	5
c. Improve status in community	1	2	3	4	5
d. Increase job effectiveness	1	2	3	4	5
e. Provide a pay increase	1	2	3	4	5
f. Lead to career advancement	1	2	3	4	5
g. Lead to a certificate or diploma	1	2	3	4	5
h. Lead to a university degree	1	2	3	4	5
i. Required by municipality	1	2	3	4	5

17. If you were to take courses in local government in a college, university or adult education centre, which one would you most likely attend? CIRCLE ONLY ONE RESPONSE.

University of Calgary	01
University of Alberta	02
University of Lethbridge	03
Athabasca University	04
Red Deer College	05
Grande Prairie Regional College	06
Olds College	07
Grant MacEwan Community College	08
Medicine Hat College	09
Lakeland College	10
Lethbridge Community College	11
Mount Royal College	12
Keyano College	13
Fairview College	14
(N.A.I.T.) Northern Alberta Institute of Technology	15
(S.A.I.T.) Southern Alberta Institute of Technology	16
Adult Education Centre in Drumheller	17
Adult Education Centre in Blairmore	18
Adult Education Centre in Drayton Valley	19
Adult Education Centre in Peace River	20
Adult Education Centre in Hinton	21
Other central location (please specify) _____	22

_____

18. Have you completed or are you now taking the University of Alberta certificate program in local government? PLEASE CIRCLE ONE.

1. Completed certificate program
2. Current student
3. No, but I plan to
4. No, and I have no plans
5. No, but I would like to know more

19. How many professional development workshops, seminars or courses have you attended in this past year? (number of workshops and seminars) _____

Section 3: Planning: Functions, Problems, and Training Preferences

20. The following is a list of skills or functions related to municipal planning. Please indicate:

- in column A, if you are performing that function primarily by yourself or through delegation to your staff
- in column B, how would you rate your performance if you perform that function primarily by yourself
- in column C, how would you rate your staff's performance, if it is a delegated responsibility
- in column D, if you feel further training is appropriate for either you or your staff, which training method do you feel is most appropriate

    1) Structured, regularly scheduled courses (SC)
    2) Short-term seminars or workshops (SW)
    3) Individual study through information kits or manuals (IS)

Please circle the appropriate response.

	A Do you delegate this function?		B Quality of your performance			C Quality of your staff's performance?			D Most appropriate training method		
	Yes	No	Poor	Fair	Good	Poor	Fair	Good	SC	SW	IS
Functions											
Deal with public enquiries/ complaints	1	2	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3
Hold public meetings/hearings	1	2	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3
Prepare brochures, newspaper stories, or other public information materials	1	2	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3
Prepare public/legal notices	1	2	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3
Evaluate subdivision proposals	1	2	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3
Draft and/or negotiate development agreements	1	2	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3

Functions	A Do you delegate this function?		B Quality of your performance			C Quality of your staff's performance?			D Most appropriate training method		
	Yes	No	Poor	Fair	Good	Poor	Fair	Good	SC	SW	IS
Prepare development permits	1	2	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3
Supervise developer operations	1	2	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3
Enforce development agreements	1	2	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3
Make presentations to council, municipal planning committees	1	2	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3
Advise council on planning matters	1	2	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3
Know government agencies involved in planning process	1	2	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3
Interact with government agencies involved in planning	1	2	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3
Understand and interpret Planning Act	1	2	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3
Draft/amend land-use by-laws	1	2	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3
Understand, interpret building codes	1	2	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3
Enforce Land-Use By-Laws	1	2	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3
Assess development, off-site levies	1	2	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3
Understand, evaluate research data	1	2	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3
Conduct research (e.g. feasibility of annexation)	1	2	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3
Evaluate consultants' proposals	1	2	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3
Prepare/assist in preparation of general municipal plans	1	2	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3
Conduct staff meetings	1	2	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3

Functions	A Do you delegate this function?		B Quality of your performance			C Quality of your staff's performance?			D Most appropriate training method		
	Yes	No	Poor	Fair	Good	Poor	Fair	Good	SC	SW	IS
Hire or supervise support staff	1	2	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3
Maintain records, conduct correspondence	1	2	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3
Prepare municipal position on appeals	1	2	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3
Present municipal position before APB	1	2	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3
Prepare/assist in preparing utility and transportation documents	1	2	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3
Areas											
Transportation planning	1	2	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3
Natural resources management	1	2	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3
Recreation planning	1	2	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3
Agricultural land use development	1	2	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3
Residential land use development	1	2	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3
Commercial land use development	1	2	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3
Sanitation	1	2	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3
Housing	1	2	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3
Hazardous waste disposal	1	2	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3
Others (please specify) _____	1	2	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3

21. How much of your time is devoted to the planning functions listed above?

1) Hardly any
2) About 25 percent of the time
3) About 50 percent of the time
4) About 75 percent of the time
5) Almost all the time

22. How much assistance do you receive from your regional planning commission? PLEASE CIRCLE ONE NUMBER.

1	2	3	4	5
Hardly any				A lot

23. How would you evaluate the quality of this assistance? PLEASE CIRCLE ONE NUMBER.

1	2	3	4	5
Poor				Excellent

Section 4: Personal Profile

This section deals with questions about yourself and your job.

24. a. What is your job title? PLEASE CIRCLE ONE NUMBER.

1. City manager
2. Town manager
3. Secretary-Treasurer
4. Municipal Secretary
5. Municipal Treasurer
6. Municipal Development Officer
7. County manager/commissioner
8. Other _____

b. Do you have another job or occupation (other than with your municipality)? CIRCLE ONE RESPONSE.

1. Yes 2. No

c. If yes, what is it?

_____

25. a. Do you work full--time or part-time for your municipality?

1. Full-time
2. Part-time

b. How many hours per week do you normally work for your municipality? CIRCLE ONE RESPONSE.

0 - 10 hours	1
11 - 20 hours	2
21 - 30 hours	3
31 - 40 hours	4
41 - 50 hours	5
51+ hours	6

26. Which municipality or municipalities do you work for?

_____

27. How long have you worked for this municipality? (If more than one municipality, give number of years for municipality you have been with longest.) _____ Years

28. How long have you worked in your present job? _____ Years

29. What is the most important problem you have in your job with your municipality?

_____

_____

_____

30. Please outline your employment history by listing the three jobs you've had before this one, how many years you worked in each position, your employer (use appropriate number), and location.

	JOB TITLE	NUMBER OF YEARS WORKED	EMPLOYER: GOVERNMENT(1), PRIVATE INDUSTRY(2) SELF-EMPLOYED(3) or UNEMPLOYED (4)	LOCATION OF EMPLOYMENT (MUNICIPALITY AND PROVINCE)
1.				
2.				
3.				

31. In terms of employment, what do you see yourself doing five years from now?

_____

_____

32. Following are a number of factors, some of which may be important to you personally, while others may have little or no importance. In column A please rate each item on the importance scale where (1) is Not Important, (4) is Very Important, and 2 or 3 is somewhere in between. In column B rate the same items to the extent that you find each one present in your current position:

	A How important is this to you? (Circle one)				B How much of this do you find in your present job? (Circle one)			
	Not Impt.			Very Impt.	None	Little	Some	A lot
Personal autonomy on the job	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Status in the community	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Opportunities to learn, develop new skills	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Good relations with my employers	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Have highly marketable skills	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Job security	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Personal fulfillment and growth	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Good relations with my staff	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Opportunities for advancement in organization	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Loyalty to my employing organization	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Commitment to my profession's values	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4

33. How clearly specified are your job responsibilities? Circle 1 if your job responsibilities are not clear and 5 if they are very clear.

1	2	3	4	5
Not clear				Very clear

34. How much pressure (e.g., unreasonable demands) do you get from each of these groups? (Circle 1 if there is hardly any pressure and 5 if there is a lot. Please circle one number for each group.)

	Hardly any				A lot
The public	1	2	3	4	5
Developers	1	2	3	4	5
The council	1	2	3	4	5
Community business people	1	2	3	4	5
Other (please specify)					
_____	1	2	3	4	5

35. When making policy recommendations to council, how often would you say your recommendations are adopted? CIRCLE ONE RESPONSE.

(1) Never
(2) About 25% of the time
(3) About half the time
(4) About 75% of the time
(5) Almost all the time
(6) I don't make policy recommendations

36. How would you describe your relationship with each of these groups or individuals? CIRCLE ONE NUMBER FOR EACH.

	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent
The council	1	2	3	4
The mayor or reeve	1	2	3	4
The public	1	2	3	4
The media	1	2	3	4
External authorities (Auditors, Dept. of Municipal Affairs)	1	2	3	4
Other municipal employees	1	2	3	4

37. What is the most difficult problem you have in your dealings with the council?

_____

_____

38. Here are some administrative functions performed by municipal administrators. Some of these may or may not be applicable to you. Please indicate which ones you perform, delegate or are not applicable (NA) to your municipality. For those tasks that you perform, circle the number that corresponds with how important you consider the task to be. Circle 1 if it is not important, 5 if it is very important and circle 2, 3 or 4 if it is somewhere in between.

				Importance				
	Perform	Delegate	NA	Not Impt.				Very Impt.
Establish and maintain inventory of office supplies	1	2	3	1	2	3	4	5
Reconcile bank statements	1	2	3	1	2	3	4	5
Prepare billings	1	2	3	1	2	3	4	5
Process cash receipts	1	2	3	1	2	3	4	5
Prepare vouchers for payments	1	2	3	1	2	3	4	5
Evaluate need for computer services and programming	1	2	3	1	2	3	4	5
Determine method and arrange for acquisition and disposal of capital assets	1	2	3	1	2	3	4	5
Prepare staff policies	1	2	3	1	2	3	4	5
Balance ledgers and rolls	1	2	3	1	2	3	4	5
Establish and maintain licensing ledgers	1	2	3	1	2	3	4	5
Develop and maintain utilities ledger	1	2	3	1	2	3	4	5
Prepare and recommend salary and wage scales	1	2	3	1	2	3	4	5
Administer disciplinary action	1	2	3	1	2	3	4	5
Counsel staff	1	2	3	1	2	3	4	5
Evaluate staff performance	1	2	3	1	2	3	4	5
Analyze staff training requirements	1	2	3	1	2	3	4	5

	Perform	Delegate	NA	Importance: Not Impt				Very Impt
Record and post accounts payable and receivable	1	2	3	1	2	3	4	5
Prepare payrolls	1	2	3	1	2	3	4	5
Develop and maintain general ledger	1	2	3	1	2	3	4	5
Mediate and resolve staff grievances	1	2	3	1	2	3	4	5
Recognize and deal with staff dissatisfaction	1	2	3	1	2	3	4	5
Develop and maintain assessment and tax rolls	1	2	3	1	2	3	4	5
Set up and maintain general files	1	2	3	1	2	3	4	5
Set up and maintain assessment records	1	2	3	1	2	3	4	5
Interview and select staff	1	2	3	1	2	3	4	5
Conduct salary negotiations	1	2	3	1	2	3	4	5

39. How long have you lived in the municipality you work for? PLEASE CIRCLE ONE

Not a resident of the municipality I work for	1
Less than a year	2
1 - 2 years	3
3 - 5 years	4
6 - 10 years	5
over 10 years	6

40. Your sex is

Female 1

Male 2

41. What is the highest level of education you have completed? CIRCLE ONE

Elementary - incomplete	01
Elementary - complete	02
Junior High - incomplete	03
Junior High - complete	04
High School - incomplete	05
High School - complete	06
Some college or university	07
Technical diploma (e.g. NAIT or SAIT)	08
Bachelor's degree	09
Master's degree	10
Doctorate	11
Professional degree (C.A., LL.B.)	12

42. If you attended college or university, what was your major field of study?

_____

43. How many of the following do you belong to?

Civic organizations (e.g., Lions, Kinsmen) Number: _____

Professional organizations (job-related) Number: _____

Social, religious, ethnic organizations

(e.g. church groups, Canadian Legion) Number: _____

44. In what year were you born? 19_____

45 Please indicate your total personal income from your municipal job for this past year before tax and deductions.

Under 5,000	01
5,000 - 9,999	02
10,000 - 14,999	03
15,000 - 19,999	04
20,000 - 24,999	05
25,000 - 29,999	06
30,000 - 34,999	07
35,000 - 39,999	08
40,000 - 44,999	09
45,000 - 49,999	10
50,000 - 54,999	11
55,000 - 59,999	12
60,000 - +	13

46. What is your mother tongue? CIRCLE ONE.

English	(1)
French	(2)
German	(3)
Ukrainian	(4)
Other (please specify)	(5) _____

Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire.